

On the constrained classical capacity of infinite-dimensional covariant quantum channels

A. S. Holevo¹

¹*Steklov Mathematical Institute, 119991 Moscow, Russia.*

The additivity of the minimal output entropy and that of the χ -capacity are known to be equivalent for finite-dimensional irreducibly covariant quantum channels. In this paper we formulate a list of conditions allowing to establish similar equivalence for infinite-dimensional covariant channels with constrained input. This is then applied to Bosonic Gaussian channels with quadratic input constraint to extend the classical capacity results of the recent paper [2] to the case where the complex structures associated with the channel and with the constraint operator need not commute. In particular, this implies a multimode generalization of the "threshold condition", obtained for single mode in [10], and the proof of the fact that under this condition the classical "Gaussian capacity" resulting from optimization over Gaussian inputs is equal to the full classical capacity.

We also investigate implications of the gauge-covariance condition for single- and multimode Bosonic Gaussian channels.

I. INTRODUCTION: FINITE DIMENSIONS

In classical information theory, the capacity is a unique characteristic of a communication channel. On the contrary, quantum channel is characterized by a whole variety of entropic quantities. A powerful tool in investigation of the *classical capacity* of a quantum channel is the *minimal output entropy*. For example, a theorem in the seminal paper [12] allowed to show that failure of the global additivity of the latter implies a similar phenomenon for the former. The present paper is devoted to further investigation of the relation between these important quantities on the level of individual channels.

For the background of this section we refer to [5], [6]. Let Φ be a quantum channel in d -dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ i.e. a linear completely positive trace-preserving map of the algebra of all linear operators in $\mathcal{H}$. A quantum analog of the Shannon capacity is the χ -*capacity* of the channel Φ :

$$C_\chi(\Phi) = \max_{\pi} \left\{ S \left(\Phi \left[\sum_x \pi(x) \rho(x) \right] \right) - \sum_x \pi(x) S(\Phi[\rho(x)]) \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where $S(\rho) = -\text{Tr} \rho \log \rho$ is the von Neumann entropy, and the maximum is over *state ensembles* i.e. finite probability distributions π ascribing probabilities $\pi(x)$ to density operators $\rho(x)$.

The *classical capacity* of the quantum channel Φ , defined as the maximal transmission rate per use of the channel, with coding and decoding chosen for increasing number n of independent uses of the channel

$$\Phi^{\otimes n} = \underbrace{\Phi \otimes \cdots \otimes \Phi}_n$$

such that the error probability goes to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$, is given by HSW theorem:

$$C(\Phi) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (1/n) C_\chi(\Phi^{\otimes n}). \quad (2)$$

In the case where the χ -capacity is additive,

$$C_\chi(\Phi^{\otimes n}) = n C_\chi(\Phi), \quad (3)$$

one has $C(\Phi) = C_\chi(\Phi)$. Unlike the classical case, this property does not hold in general, due to the possibility of *entangled* encodings at the input of the channel $\Phi^{\otimes n}$ [3].

An obvious upper estimate for $C_\chi(\Phi)$ is

$$C_\chi(\Phi) \leq \max_{\rho} S(\Phi[\rho]) - \check{S}(\Phi), \quad (4)$$

where the minimal output entropy of the quantum channel Φ is defined as

$$\check{S}(\Phi) = \min_{\rho} S(\Phi(\rho)).$$

The first term in the right-hand side of (5) is additive for all channels:

$$\max_{\rho^{(n)}} S(\Phi^{\otimes n}[\rho^{(n)}]) = n \max_{\rho} S(\Phi[\rho]). \quad (5)$$

This is a simple corollary of (sub)additivity of the von Neumann entropy with respect to tensor products (see also lemma 2 below).

For some channels (4) may become equality, allowing to reduce the additivity (3) of C_χ to the additivity of the minimal output entropy

$$\check{S}(\Phi^{\otimes n}) = n \check{S}(\Phi). \quad (6)$$

This is the case for irreducibly covariant channels. Channel Φ is *covariant* if there is a continuous (projective) unitary representation $g \rightarrow V_g$ of a symmetry group G in $\mathcal{H}$ such that

$$\Phi[V_g \rho V_g^*] = U_g \Phi[\rho] U_g^*, \quad (7)$$

where U_g are unitary operators, and *irreducibly covariant* if the representation $g \rightarrow V_g$ is irreducible. In this case,

assuming compactness of G , one has for arbitrary density operator ρ

$$I/d = \int_G V_g \rho V_g^* \pi^0(dg),$$

where I is the unit operator in $\mathcal{H}$, $\pi^0(dg)$ is the invariant probability measure on G (this follows from the orthogonality relations for irreducible representation). Then one can show, see e.g. [4], that

$$\max_{\rho} S(\Phi[\rho]) = S(\Phi[I/d]), \quad (8)$$

and

$$C_{\chi}(\Phi) = \max_{\rho} S(\Phi[\rho]) - \check{S}(\Phi) = S(\Phi[I/d]) - \check{S}(\Phi), \quad (9)$$

making (4) the equality. The optimal ensemble for $C_{\chi}(\Phi)$ is $\{\pi^0(dg), V_g \rho_0 V_g^*\}$ where ρ_0 is a minimizer for $S(\Phi(\rho))$. If the group G is not finite, then this is a generalized ensemble in the sense of the next Section.

Assume moreover that additivity (6) of the minimal output entropy holds, then

$$\begin{aligned} n \left[\max_{\rho} S(\Phi[\rho]) - \check{S}(\Phi) \right] &= n C_{\chi}(\Phi) \leq C_{\chi}(\Phi^{\otimes n}) \\ &\leq \max_{\rho^{(n)}} S(\Phi^{\otimes n}[\rho^{(n)}]) - \check{S}(\Phi^{\otimes n}) \\ &= n \left[\max_{\rho} S(\Phi[\rho]) - \check{S}(\Phi) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from (9), the first inequality – from the definition of C_{χ} , the second inequality – from (4) applied to $\Phi^{\otimes n}$, the second equality – from the equality (5) (for irreducibly covariant channels it is just a consequence of (8), and from the assumption (6)). Thus $C_{\chi}(\Phi^{\otimes n}) = n C_{\chi}(\Phi) = n [S(\Phi[I/d]) - \check{S}(\Phi)]$ and

$$C(\Phi) = C_{\chi}(\Phi) = S(\Phi[I/d]) - \check{S}(\Phi).$$

II. INFINITE-DIMENSIONAL CASE

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a separable complex Hilbert space, $\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ the algebra of all bounded operators in $\mathcal{H}$, $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H})$ the space of trace-class operators, and $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$ the convex set of density operators in $\mathcal{H}$. *Quantum channel* is a linear completely positive trace-preserving map Φ in $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H})$.

Generalized ensemble is a pair $\{\pi(dx), \rho(x)\}$ where π is a probability measure on a standard Borel space $\mathcal{X}$ and $x \rightarrow \rho(x)$ is a measurable map from $\mathcal{X}$ to $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$. The *average state* of the generalized ensemble π is defined as the barycenter of the probability measure

$$\bar{\rho}_{\pi} = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \rho(x) \pi(dx).$$

The conventional ensembles correspond to finitely supported measures.

In the infinite-dimensional case one usually has to consider the input constraints to avoid infinite values of the capacities. Let H be a positive selfadjoint operator in $\mathcal{H}$, which usually represents energy of the input. We consider the input states with constrained energy: $\text{Tr} \rho H \leq E$, where E is a fixed positive constant. Since the operator H can be unbounded, care should be taken in defining the trace; we put $\text{Tr} \rho H = \int_0^{\infty} \lambda dm_{\rho}(\lambda)$, where $m_{\rho}(\lambda) = \text{Tr} \rho E(\lambda)$, and $E(\lambda)$ is the spectral function of the selfadjoint operator H . Then the *constrained χ -capacity* is given by the following generalization of the expression (1):

$$C_{\chi}(\Phi, H, E) = \sup_{\pi: \text{Tr} \bar{\rho}_{\pi} H \leq E} \chi(\pi), \quad (10)$$

where

$$\chi(\pi) = S(\Phi[\bar{\rho}_{\pi}]) - \int_{\mathcal{X}} S(\Phi[\rho(x)]) \pi(dx). \quad (11)$$

To ensure that this expression is defined correctly, certain additional conditions should be imposed upon the channel Φ and the constraint operator H (see [7], [6], Sec. 11.5), which are always fulfilled in the Gaussian case we consider below.

Denote $H^{(n)} = H \otimes I \cdots \otimes I + \cdots + I \otimes \cdots \otimes I \otimes H$, then the *constrained classical capacity* is given by the expression

$$C(\Phi, H, E) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} C_{\chi}(\Phi^{\otimes n}, H^{(n)}, nE) \quad (12)$$

generalizing (2) [6].

Consider the following constrained set of states

$$\mathcal{E}_E = \{\rho : \text{Tr} \rho H \leq E\},$$

We have an obvious estimate

$$C_{\chi}(\Phi, H, E) \leq \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{E}_E} S(\Phi[\rho]) - \inf_{\rho} S(\Phi[\rho]). \quad (13)$$

Proposition 1. *Consider the following assumptions:*

1. $\sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{E}_E} S(\Phi[\rho])$ is attained on a state ρ_E^0 ;
2. $\inf_{\rho} S(\Phi[\rho])$ is attained on a state ρ_0 ;
3. Φ is a covariant channel in the sense (7), and there exists a Borel probability measure π_E^0 on G such that

$$\rho_E^0 = \int_G V_g \rho_0 V_g^* \pi_E^0(dg).$$

4. the minimal output entropy of the channel Φ is additive in the sense (6),

Then under the conditions 1-3

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\chi}(\Phi, H, E) &= \sup_{\rho \in \mathcal{E}_E} S(\Phi[\rho]) - \inf_{\rho} S(\Phi[\rho]) \\ &= S(\Phi[\rho_E^0]) - S(\Phi[\rho_0]), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

and the optimal ensemble for C_χ consists of the states $V_g \rho_0 V_g^*$ with the probability distribution $\pi_E^0(dg)$.
If, in addition, the condition 4 holds, then

$$C_\chi(\Phi^{\otimes n}, H^{(n)}, nE) = nC_\chi(\Phi, H, E)$$

and

$$C(\Phi, H, E) = C_\chi(\Phi, H, E) = S(\Phi[\rho_E^0]) - S(\Phi[\rho_0]).$$

Proof. To prove the first statement it is sufficient to substitute the ensemble $\{\pi_E^0(dg), V_g \rho_0 V_g^*\}$ into the expression (11). For covariant channels the integral term is equal to $S(\Phi[\rho_0])$, thus we obtain that the right-hand side of (13) is also a lower estimate for $C_\chi(\Phi, H, E)$.

To prove the second statement we use lemma 11.20 of [6]

Lemma 2.

$$\sup_{\rho^{(n)}: \text{Tr } \rho^{(n)} H^{(n)} \leq nE} S(\Phi^{\otimes n}[\rho^{(n)}]) = n \sup_{\rho: \text{Tr } \rho H \leq E} S(\Phi[\rho]).$$

Proof. We give the proof here for completeness. We first show that

$$\sup_{\rho^{(n)}: \text{Tr } \rho^{(n)} H^{(n)} \leq nE} S(\Phi^{\otimes n}[\rho^{(n)}]) \leq n \sup_{\rho: \text{Tr } \rho H \leq E} S(\Phi[\rho]). \quad (15)$$

$$\begin{aligned} n [S(\Phi[\rho_E^0]) - S(\Phi[\rho_0])] &= nC_\chi(\Phi, H, E) \leq C_\chi(\Phi^{\otimes n}, H^{(n)}, nE) \leq \max_{\rho^{(n)}: \text{Tr } \rho^{(n)} H^{(n)} \leq nE} S(\Phi^{\otimes n}[\rho^{(n)}]) - \min_{\rho^{(n)}} S(\Phi^{\otimes n}[\rho^{(n)}]) \\ &= n \left[\max_{\rho: \text{Tr } \rho H \leq E} S(\Phi[\rho]) - \min_{\rho} S(\Phi[\rho]) \right] = n [S(\Phi[\rho_E^0]) - S(\Phi[\rho_0])], \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from (14), the first inequality from the definition of C_χ , the second inequality from (13) applied to $\Phi^{\otimes n}$, the second equality from lemma 2 and the condition 4. Summarizing,

$$\begin{aligned} C_\chi(\Phi^{\otimes n}, H^{(n)}, nE) &= nC_\chi(\Phi, H, E) \\ &= n [S(\Phi[\rho_E^0]) - S(\Phi[\rho_0])], \end{aligned}$$

hence the second statement follows. $\square$

III. THE CASE OF BOSONIC GAUSSIAN CHANNELS

In the papers [2], [9], [1] a solution of the long-standing quantum Gaussian optimizers conjecture was given for gauge-covariant or contravariant Bosonic Gaussian channels. In particular, the constrained classical capacity was computed under the assumption that the constraint operator is gauge-invariant with respect to the same complex

Indeed, denoting by ρ_j the partial state of $\rho^{(n)}$ in the j -th tensor factor of $\mathcal{H}_A^{\otimes n}$ and letting $\bar{\rho} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_j$, we have

$$S(\Phi^{\otimes n}[\rho^{(n)}]) \leq \sum_{j=1}^n S(\Phi[\rho_j]) \leq nS(\Phi[\bar{\rho}]),$$

where in the first inequality we used subadditivity of the quantum entropy, while in the second – its concavity. Moreover,

$$\text{Tr } \bar{\rho} H = \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr } \rho^{(n)} H^{(n)} \leq E,$$

hence (15) follows. In the opposite direction, take $\rho^{(n)} = \rho_E^{0 \otimes n}$ and use the additivity of the entropy for product states. $\square$

Then we have similarly to the finite-dimensional case

structure as the channel. Basing on observations of previous section and using the fact that a general Bosonic Gaussian channel is irreducibly covariant under the group of displacements (the Weyl group), we can relax this assumption.

In this section we systematically use notations and some results from the book [6] where further references are given (see also Appendix). Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the space of an irreducible representation $z \rightarrow W(z)$; $z \in Z$, of the Canonical Commutation Relations, where Z is a finite-dimensional symplectic space $(\mathbb{R}^{2s}, \Delta)$ with

$$\Delta = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & & \\ -1 & 0 & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & 0 & 1 \\ & & & -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \equiv \text{diag} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

Here $W(z) = \exp i R z$ are the unitary Weyl operators,

where

$$Rz = \sum_{j=1}^s (x_j q_j + y_j p_j),$$

and

$$R = [q_1 \ p_1 \ \dots \ q_s \ p_s]$$

is the row vector of the canonical observables of the quantized system, while $z = [x_1 \ y_1 \ \dots \ x_s \ y_s]^t$ is the column vector of the real parameters.

A centered Gaussian state ρ on $\mathfrak{L}(\mathcal{H})$ is determined by its covariance matrix $\alpha = \text{Re Tr } R^t S R$ which is a real symmetric $s \times s$ -matrix satisfying

$$\alpha \geq \pm \frac{i}{2} \Delta$$

The entropy of ρ is equal to

$$S(\rho) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Sp } g \left(\text{abs}(\Delta^{-1} \alpha) - \frac{I}{2} \right), \quad (17)$$

where Sp is used to denote trace of a matrix as distinct from the trace Tr of operators in the underlying Hilbert space [8]. The operator $A = \Delta^{-1} \alpha$ has the eigenvalues $\pm i \alpha_j$ (where α_j are real), hence its matrix is diagonalizable (in the complex domain). For any diagonalizable matrix $M = U \text{diag}(m_j) U^{-1}$, we denote $\text{abs}(M) = U \text{diag}(|m_j|) U^{-1}$.

Let $H = \sum_{j,k=1}^s \epsilon_{jk} R_j R_k$, where $\epsilon = [\epsilon_{jk}]$ is a symmetric positive definite matrix, be a quadratic energy operator. Notice that it always has an associated complex structure J_H satisfying $[\epsilon \Delta, J_H] = 0$. This is the orthogonal operator from the polar decomposition of the operator $-\epsilon \Delta$, see sec. 12.2.3 [6] for detail.

A centered Gaussian channel Φ is defined by the relation

$$\Phi^*[W(z)] = W(Kz) \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} z^t \mu z \right). \quad (18)$$

where (K, μ) are the matrix parameters satisfying

$$\mu \geq \pm \frac{i}{2} (\Delta - K^t \Delta K).$$

The action of the channel on the centered Gaussian state with a covariance matrix α is described by the equation

$$\alpha \rightarrow K^t \alpha K + \mu.$$

A Bosonic Gaussian channel is irreducibly covariant with respect to the representation $z \rightarrow W(z)$ in the sense

$$\Phi[W(z) \rho W(z)^*] = W(K^s z) \Phi[\rho] W(K^s z)^*, \quad z \in Z,$$

where $K^s = \Delta^{-1} K^t \Delta$, see e.g. sec. 12.4.2 in [6].

The conditions 1 of proposition 1 follows from the argument of sec. 12.5 [6], moreover ρ_E^0 is a centered Gaussian state with a covariance matrix

$$\alpha_E^0 = \arg \max_{\alpha: \text{Sp} \alpha \leq E} \text{Sp } g \left(\text{abs}(\Delta^{-1} [K^t \alpha K + \mu]) - \frac{I}{2} \right)$$

Assuming that the channel Φ is gauge-covariant or contravariant with respect to a complex structure J in Z , the conditions 2 and 4 follow from the results of the paper [2] concerning the minimal output entropy. Moreover, ρ_0 can be taken as the vacuum state related to the complex structure J . It is shown in sec. 12.3.2 of [6] that the vacuum state related to the complex structure J is the pure centered Gaussian state with the covariance matrix $\frac{1}{2} \Delta J$.

The condition 3 is fulfilled provided

$$\alpha_E^0 \geq \frac{1}{2} \Delta J. \quad (19)$$

In this case

$$\rho_E^0 = \int_Z W(z) \rho_0 W(z)^* \pi_E^0(dz),$$

where $\pi_E^0(dz)$ is the centered Gaussian distribution on Z with the covariance matrix $\alpha_E^0 - \frac{1}{2} \Delta J$. One can check this by comparing the quantum characteristic functions of both sides. The optimizing ensemble consists thus of the J -coherent states $W(z) \rho_0 W(z)^*$ with the probability distribution $\pi_E^0(dz)$.

The constrained classical capacity of the channel Φ is equal to

$$C(\Phi; H, E) = C_\chi(\Phi; H, E) \quad (20)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \max_{\alpha: \text{Sp} \alpha \leq E} \text{Sp } g \left(\text{abs}(\Delta^{-1} [K^t \alpha K + \mu]) - \frac{I}{2} \right) \\ & - \frac{1}{2} \text{Sp } g \left(\text{abs}(\Delta^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{2} K^t \Delta J K + \mu \right]) - \frac{I}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Gauge-covariance of the channel Φ with respect to a complex structure J is equivalent to the conditions

$$[K, J] = 0, \quad [\Delta^{-1} \mu, J] = 0. \quad (21)$$

Given a symmetric $\mu > 0$, one can always find a complex structure J , satisfying $[\Delta^{-1} \mu, J] = 0$; it is just the orthogonal operator from the polar decomposition of the operator $\Delta^{-1} \mu$ in the Euclidean space (Z, μ) , cf. (30). Then the first equation becomes a restriction for admissible K . For gauge-contravariant channels it is replaced by $\{K, J\} = 0$.

In the paper [10] the *Gaussian capacities* obtained by optimization over Gaussian inputs were computed for a generic non-degenerate single-mode channel when the input signal energy is above certain threshold. Our observations imply in particular that these Gaussian capacities are in fact equal to the full classical capacities, and the inequality (19) appears as the multimode generalization of the threshold condition in [10].

Let us confirm this by calculation of the example of squeezed noise channel. The channel is described by the parameters

$$K = k \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mu = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \mu_2 \end{bmatrix}; \quad \mu_1 \mu_2 \geq \frac{1}{4} |k^2 - 1|^2.$$

This describes attenuation ($0 < k < 1$), amplification ($1 < k$) and additive noise ($k = 1$) channels, with the background squeezed noise. Take the energy operator $H = q^2 + p^2$ with $\epsilon = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and the corresponding complex structure $J_H = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$.

The complex structure of the channel satisfying (21) is given by

$$J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\sqrt{\mu_2/\mu_1} \\ \sqrt{\mu_1/\mu_2} & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

which does not commute with J_H unless $\mu_1 = \mu_2$. The covariance matrix of the squeezed vacuum is

$$\frac{1}{2}\Delta J = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\mu_1/\mu_2} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\mu_2/\mu_1} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The eigenvalues of the matrix

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta^{-1} \left[\frac{1}{2} K^t \Delta J K + \mu \right] \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mu_2 + \frac{k^2}{2} \sqrt{\mu_2/\mu_1} \\ -\left(\mu_1 + \frac{k^2}{2} \sqrt{\mu_1/\mu_2}\right) & 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

are equal to $\pm i(\sqrt{\mu_1\mu_2} + k^2/2)$, hence the second term in (20) is $g(\sqrt{\mu_1\mu_2} + (k^2 - 1)/2)$.

To compute the first term, we can restrict to diagonal covariance matrices

$$\alpha = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq E, \quad \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \geq \frac{1}{4}.$$

The matrix

$$\Delta^{-1} [K^t \alpha K + \mu] = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \mu_2 + k^2 \alpha_2 \\ -(\mu_1 + k^2 \alpha_1) & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

has the eigenvalues $\pm i\sqrt{(\mu_1 + k^2 \alpha_1)(\mu_2 + k^2 \alpha_2)}$, so that the maximized expression is

$$g\left(\sqrt{(\mu_1 + k^2 \alpha_1)(\mu_2 + k^2 \alpha_2)} - 1/2\right).$$

Since $g(x)$ is increasing, we have to maximize $(\mu_1 + k^2 \alpha_1)(\mu_2 + k^2 \alpha_2)$ under the constraints $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq E$, $\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \geq \frac{1}{4}$. The first constraint gives the values

$$\alpha_1^0 = E/2 + (\mu_2 - \mu_1)/2k^2, \quad \alpha_2^0 = E/2 - (\mu_2 - \mu_1)/2k^2$$

corresponding to the maximal value of the first term

$$g\left(\frac{1}{2}(k^2 E + (\mu_1 + \mu_2) - 1)\right).$$

The second constraint will be automatically fulfilled provided we impose the condition (19) which amounts to $\alpha_1^0 \geq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\mu_1/\mu_2}$, $\alpha_2^0 \geq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\mu_2/\mu_1}$, or, introducing the squeezing parameter $\eta = \sqrt{\mu_2/\mu_1}$

$$E \geq \frac{1}{2} \left[\eta + \eta^{-1} + |\eta - \eta^{-1}| \left(1 + \frac{2}{k^2} \sqrt{\mu_1\mu_2} \right) \right],$$

where the term $\frac{1}{2}(\eta + \eta^{-1})$ corresponds to the energy of the squeezed vacuum $\text{Sp}(\frac{1}{2}\Delta J)\epsilon$. Under this condition

$$C(\Phi; H, E) = C_\chi(\Phi; H, E) = g\left(\frac{1}{2}(k^2 E + (\mu_1 + \mu_2) - 1)\right) - g(\sqrt{\mu_1\mu_2} + (k^2 - 1)/2).$$

These values up to notations coincide with those computed in [10], Cor. 2.

IV. IMPLICATIONS OF GAUGE-COVARIANCE FOR NONDEGENERATE GAUSSIAN CHANNELS

The solution of the Gaussian optimizers conjecture given in [2] applies to a more general situation where the complex structures J_A, J_B at the input and the output of the channel need not coincide. In that case the gauge covariance condition (21) take the form (see [6],

Eq. (12.147))

$$K J_B - J_A K = 0, \quad [\Delta^{-1} \mu, J_B] = 0. \quad (22)$$

Let us investigate how restrictive is this condition, assuming that both μ and K are nondegenerate matrices. As already mentioned, there exist J_B satisfying the second equation, therefore we ask for existence of the complex structure J_A satisfying the first equation. Since K is nondegenerate, this is equivalent to the question: when does the operator $J = K J_B K^{-1}$ define a complex structure? Notice that always $J^2 = -I$, therefore a necessary and sufficient condition for that is (28), which in our case

transforms into

$$\Delta K J_B K^{-1} = - (K^t)^{-1} J_B^t K^t \Delta \geq 0.$$

Taking into account nondegeneracy of K , this is equivalent to

$$K^t \Delta K J_B = -J_B^t K^t \Delta K \geq 0$$

or

$$(K^t \Delta K \Delta^{-1}) \Delta J_B = -J_B^t \Delta (K^t \Delta K \Delta^{-1})^t \geq 0. \quad (23)$$

Notice that $\Delta J_B = -J_B^t \Delta \geq 0$ since J_B is a complex structure satisfying (28).

Let us compute the operator $K^t \Delta K \Delta^{-1}$. It will be convenient to rearrange the coordinates so that $z = [x_1 \dots x_s y_1 \dots y_s]^t$, then

$$\Delta = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & I \\ -I & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad K = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$K^t \Delta K \Delta^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} A^t D - C^t B & C^t A - A^t C \\ B^t D - D^t B & D^t A - B^t C \end{bmatrix}. \quad (24)$$

In the case of single mode, A, B, C, D are real numbers, hence

$$K^t \Delta K \Delta^{-1} = \det K \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

and the condition (23) is fulfilled provided $\det K > 0$. We thus obtain a result which is implicit in Sec. 12.6.1 of [6]: all the nondegenerate single-mode Gaussian channels with positive $\det K$ are gauge-covariant. In the case $\det K > 0$ we obtain gauge-contravariant channels with $K J_B + J_A K = 0$ instead of the first equation in (22).

In the case of many modes, $s \geq 2$, by asking the operator (24) to be a multiple of identity, we obtain a sufficient condition for (23), and hence for the channel to be gauge-covariant. On the other case, for many modes it is easy to give an example of a nondegenerate Gaussian channel which is not gauge-covariant for any choice of complex structures J_A, J_B . Consider the canonical complex structure $J_B = \Delta^{-1}$. Then the condition (23) is equivalent to the requirement that the matrix (24) is symmetric and nonnegative definite. Take a positive diagonal matrix μ satisfying the second condition in (22) and $K = \begin{bmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & D \end{bmatrix}$. The equality in (23) is not fulfilled unless $D^t = D$. In particular, this is the case for “not-so-normal mode decomposition” of K [13] with non-diagonal Jordan blocks.

V. APPENDIX. COMPLEX STRUCTURES IN A SYMPLECTIC SPACE

Denote $\Delta(z, z') = z^t \Delta z'$ the symplectic form in Z . A basis $\{e_j, h_j; j = 1, \dots, s\}$ in Z is called *symplectic* if

$$\Delta(e_j, h_k) = \delta_{jk}, \quad \Delta(e_j, e_k) = \Delta(h_j, h_k) = 0 \quad (25)$$

for all $j, k = 1, \dots, s$. The transition matrix T from the initial symplectic basis in Z to the new symplectic basis is a matrix of *symplectic transformation* in (Z, Δ) , which is characterized by the property

$$\Delta(Tz, Tz') = \Delta(z, z'); \quad z, z' \in Z.$$

Operator J in (Z, Δ) is called *operator of complex structure* if

$$J^2 = -I, \quad (26)$$

where I is the identity operator in Z , and it is Δ -positive in the sense that the bilinear form

$$j(z, z') = \Delta(z, Jz') \quad (27)$$

is an inner product in Z . Note that Δ -positivity is equivalent to the conditions

$$\Delta J = -J^t \Delta, \quad \Delta J \geq 0. \quad (28)$$

Operator J defines the structure of complex unitary space in Z (of dimensionality s) in which $iz = Jz$ and the inner product is

$$j(z, z') + i\Delta(z, z') = \Delta(z, Jz') + i\Delta(z, z').$$

In what follows we will consider bilinear forms α, μ in the space $Z = \mathbb{R}^{2s}$, and the matrices of such forms will be denoted by the same letters, e.g. $\alpha(z, z') = z^t \alpha z'$, etc.

Lemma 3. *Let $\alpha(z, z') = z^t \alpha z'$ be an inner product in the symplectic space (Z, Δ) . Then there is a symplectic basis $\{e_j, h_j; j = 1, \dots, s\}$ in Z such that the form α is diagonal with the matrix*

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \text{diag} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_j & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_j \end{bmatrix}, \quad (29)$$

where $\alpha_j > 0$.

Consider the operator $A = \Delta^{-1} \alpha$ satisfying

$$\alpha(z, z') = \Delta(z, Az').$$

The operator A is skew-symmetric in the Euclidean space $(Z, \alpha) : A^* = -A$. According to a theorem from linear algebra, there is an orthogonal basis $\{e_j, h_j\}$ in (Z, α) and positive numbers $\{\alpha_j\}$ such that

$$Ae_j = \alpha_j h_j; \quad Ah_j = -\alpha_j e_j.$$

Choosing the normalization $\alpha(e_j, e_j) = \alpha(h_j, h_j) = \alpha_j$ gives the symplectic basis in (Z, Δ) with the required properties.

For arbitrary inner product α in Z there is at least one operator of complex structure J , commuting with the operator $A = \Delta^{-1} \alpha$, namely, the orthogonal operator J from the polar decomposition

$$A = |A| J = J |A| \quad (30)$$

in the Euclidean space (Z, α) . Applying Lemma 3, we obtain that there is a symplectic basis $\{e_j, h_j; j = 1, \dots, s\}$ in which the form α is diagonal with the matrix (29) while J has the matrix

$$\tilde{J} = \text{diag} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (31)$$

so that

$$Je_j = h_j, \quad Jh_j = -e_j.$$

With every complex structure we can associate the cyclic one-parameter group $\{e^{\varphi J}; \varphi \in [0, 2\pi]\}$ of symplectic transformations which we call the *gauge group*. The gauge group in Z induces the unitary group of the *gauge transformations* in $\mathcal{H}$ by the formula

$$W(e^{\varphi J} z) = e^{-i\varphi G} W(z) e^{i\varphi G}, \quad (32)$$

where $G = \sum_{j=1}^s \tilde{a}_j^\dagger \tilde{a}_j$ is the *total number operator* in $\mathcal{H}$.

An operator X in $\mathcal{H}$ is called *gauge invariant* if

$$e^{-i\varphi G} X e^{i\varphi G} = X$$

for all $\varphi \in [0, 2\pi]$. By using (32) and (28) we find that a quadratic operator $X = R\epsilon R^T$, where ϵ is a symmetric positive matrix, is gauge invariant if

$$[J, \epsilon \Delta] = 0,$$

i.e. J is the operator of complex structure from the polar decomposition of the skew-symmetric operator $-\epsilon \Delta$ in the Euclidean space (Z, ϵ) equipped with the inner product $\epsilon(z, z') = -z^t \Delta \epsilon \Delta z'$. Such a complex structure exists for every energy matrix ϵ .

Consider a channel Φ in $\mathfrak{T}(\mathcal{H})$. Assume that in the space Z some operator of complex structure J is fixed and let G be the operator generating the unitary group of gauge transformations in $\mathcal{H}$ according to the formula (32). The channel is called *gauge covariant*, if

$$\Phi[e^{i\varphi G} \rho e^{-i\varphi G}] = e^{i\varphi G} \Phi[\rho] e^{-i\varphi G} \quad (33)$$

for all input states ρ and all $\varphi \in [0, 2\pi]$. For the Gaussian channel with parameters (K, μ) this reduces to the conditions (21). Thus, a natural choice of the complex structure in Z is given by any J , commuting with the operator $\Delta^{-1}\mu$. Existence of such a complex structure for nondegenerate matrix μ follows from the proof of lemma 3.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is grateful to M. E. Shirokov for comments and discussions. The work was supported by the grant of Russian Scientific Foundation (project No 14-21-00162).

-
- [1] V. Giovannetti, R. Garcia-Patron, N. J. Cerf, A. S. Holevo, "Ultimate classical communication rates of quantum optical channels," Nat. Phot. **8**, 796 (2014).
 - [2] V. Giovannetti, A. S. Holevo, R. Garcia-Patron, "A solution of Gaussian optimizer conjecture for quantum channels," Comm. Math. Phys. **334**:3, 1553-1571 (2015).
 - [3] M. B. Hastings, "A counterexample to additivity of minimum output entropy," Nat. Phys., **5**, 255 - 257 (2009).
 - [4] A. S. Holevo, "Additivity conjecture and covariant channels," Int. J. Quant. Inform., **3**, 41-48 (2005).
 - [5] A. S. Holevo and V. Giovannetti, "Quantum channels and their entropic characteristics," Rep. Prog. Phys. **75**, 046001 (2012).
 - [6] A. S. Holevo, *Quantum systems, channels, information. A mathematical introduction* (De Gruyter, Berlin-Boston, 2012).
 - [7] A. S. Holevo and M. E. Shirokov, "Continuous ensembles and the χ -capacity of infinite-dimensional channels," Probab. Theory and Appl. **50**, 86-98 (2005).
 - [8] A. S. Holevo, M. Sohma, O. Hirota, "Error exponents for quantum channels with constrained inputs," Rep. Math. Phys., **46**, 343-358 (2000).
 - [9] A. Mari, V. Giovannetti, and A. S. Holevo, "Quantum state majorization at the output of bosonic Gaussian channels," Nat. Comm., **5**, 3826 (2014).
 - [10] J. Schäfer, E. Karpov, R. García-Patrón, O. V. Pilyavets, and N. J. Cerf, "Equivalence Relations for the Classical Capacity of Single-Mode Gaussian Quantum Channels," Phys. Rev. Lett., **111**, 030503 (2013).
 - [11] M. E. Shirokov, "Continuity of the von Neumann entropy," Comm. Math. Phys. **296**, 625-654 (2010).
 - [12] P. W. Shor, "Equivalence of additivity questions in quantum information theory," Comm. Math. Phys. **246**, 453-472 (2004).
 - [13] M. M. Wolf, "A not-so-normal mode decomposition," arXiv:0707.0604 (2007).